



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,689	02/23/2004	Dale M. Schultz	LOT920040010 (043)	1338
46321 7590 03/18/2008 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487				
EXAMINER				
CHAUHAN, LOREN B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2193				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,689

Applicant(s)

SCHULTZ, DALE M.

Examiner

LOREN CHAUHAN

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12 and 14-15 are amended. Claims 1-16 are pending for examination in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meade (US Pat. No. 6,507,812).
4. As per claim 1, Meade teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for testing multi-byte data handling (col. 4, lines 45-47, col. 8, lines 25-29, col. 7, lines 8-9) comprising the steps of:
converting each single byte native text character of a source string to a multi-byte (col. 7, lines 8-9) equivalent to produce a multi-byte test string (810, fig 8; col. 8, lines 23-29); and,
providing said multi-byte test string to a testing tool for use when testing a computer program (700, fig. 7; col. 7, lines 45-47; col. 8, lines 27-28).

5. Meade does not explicitly teach multi-byte equivalent is a wide Latin equivalent.
6. However, Meade teaches mock translation file is created by converting single-byte character (col. 8, lines 23-29) to its double or multi-byte equivalent (col. 7, lines 7-9) and can be displayed in place of the English or foreign-language (col. 2, lines 61-63) thus teaches multi-byte equivalent is a wide Latin equivalent.
7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Meade's system of converting single-byte to equivalent multi-byte test string to represent foreign-language which requires multi-byte; so that Meade's system can be used in conjunction with the functional verification phase of testing software under development by testers who may not be skilled in any other language (Meade col. 3, lines 9-12).
8. As per claim 2, Meade does not explicitly teach wherein said wide Latin equivalent comprises Unicode characters ranging from U+FF21 through U+FF5A.
9. However, Meade teaches mock translation file is created by converting single-byte character (col. 8, lines 23-29) to its double or multi-byte equivalent (col. 7, lines 7-9) and can be displayed in place of the English or foreign-language (col. 2, lines 61-63) thus teaches multi-byte equivalent is a wide Latin equivalent. Further official notice is

taken that it is well known in the art that Unicode characters for Latin language is ranging from U+FF21 through U+FF5A.

10. As per claims 3 and 4, Meade does not explicitly teach the method, wherein said converting step comprises the steps of: for each said single byte native text character, determining whether said character falls within a range of alphanumeric characters; and, for each said single byte native character, converting said character to a multi-byte equivalent to produce a multi-byte test string only if said character falls within said range.

11. However, Meade teaches that the mock translation process produces an output which contains, for a given word or phrase, an open square bracket, a string of placeholder characters, the original word or phrase and a close square-bracket (col. 4, lines 61-64), store in to localization file (col. 5, lines 33-36) and then convert single-byte character to its equivalent multi-byte character (col. 8, lines 23-25); and it is known in the art as per ASCII standards all the alphanumeric characters fall within a range i.e. for characters A-Z the ASCII range is 0x21-0x3A and thus using this convention the invention of Meade can convert these characters or input a placeholders for these characters.

12. It is obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that the method as taught by Meade can convert single byte alphanumeric

characters to multi-byte characters because it adds special characters as a placeholders when it converts to multi-byte characters (col. 5, lines 25-27).

13. As per claim 5, Meade teaches the invention including a method of testing multi-byte data handling, wherein said converting step comprises the step of adding a fixed integer value to each said character to produce said wide Latin equivalent (col. 7, lines 48-50; col. 5, lines 1-15; col. 2, lines 61-63).

14. As per claim 11, Meade teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for testing multi-byte data handling (col. 4, lines 45-47, col. 8, lines 25-29, col. 7, lines 8-9) comprising the steps of:

first loading a first single-byte character in a test string (col. 7, lines 45-47);

adding a base value to said loaded character to convert said character to a multi-byte equivalent character (col. 5, lines 1-15; col. 8, lines 23-25; col. 7, lines 8-9);

inserting said multi-byte equivalent character into a result string at a position in said result string equivalent to a corresponding position in said test string (col. 8, lines 27-29).

15. Meade does not explicitly teach the second loading a next single byte character in said test string; and, repeating said adding, inserting and second loading steps for each remaining character in said test string; and multi-byte equivalent is a wide Latin equivalent.

16. However, Meade teaches that each entry in the file is mock translated by converting each single-byte character to its double-byte equivalent (col. 8, lines 23-25); and can be displayed in place of the English or foreign-language (col. 2, lines 61-63) thus teaches loading a next single byte character in said test string; and, repeating said adding, inserting and second loading steps for each remaining character in said test string; and multi-byte equivalent is a wide Latin equivalent.

17. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the converting method of Meade to convert single-byte character to its equivalent double-byte character so that this tool can be used in conjunction with the functional verification phase of testing software under development by testers who may not be skilled in any other language (col. 3, lines 8-11).

18. As per claim 12, Meade teaches adding step comprises the step of adding a base value to said loaded character (col. 5, lines 1-15) to convert said character to a wide Latin equivalent (col. 2, lines 61-63; e.g. mock translation data is displayed in a software application in place of the English or foreign-language (i.e. Latin equivalent). Further official notice is taken that it is well known in the art that Unicode characters for Latin language is ranging from U+FF21 through U+FF5A.

19. As per claim 13, Meade does not explicitly teach further comprising the step of performing said adding step only if said loaded character is an alphanumeric character.

Art Unit: 2193

However, it is known in the art to recognize the alphanumeric characters using ASCII convention thus it is obvious to use ASCII convention with adding step as taught by Meade (col. 5, lines 1-15) to convert wide characters from a single byte characters.

20. As per claims 6-10 are similar to the claims 1-3 and 5, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 1-3 and 5 above.

21. As per claims 14-16 are similar to the claims 11-13, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 11-13 above.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LOREN CHAUHAN whose telephone number is 571-270-1554. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thr. 9:30-5:00 (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Art Unit: 2193

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

Loren Chauhan
Examiner
Art Unit 2193

/L. C/
Examiner, Art Unit 2193